REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

(#) Numbers in parentheses correspond to paragraph numbers of the Office Action.

(1) Reexamination and reconsideration of this application as amended is requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 9 and 17 are amended. By this amendment, claims 13, 25, 26 and 28-32 are canceled without prejudice. No new claims are added. After this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 27 remain pending in this application.

(2-4) Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings, for approving the corrections to the specification, and for withdrawing the objection to claims 9 and 13.

Claim Objections

(5) The Examiner objected to claims 26 and 28 under 37 CFR ¶1.75(c), as being of improper form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have canceled claims 26 and 28, which renders the Examiner's objection moot.

Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

(6-7) The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. As stated hereinabove, applicants have canceled claims 26 and 28, which renders the Examiner's rejection moot.

Page 9 of 13

Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

(8-9) The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 15-17, 19-20, 22-23, 26-28 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks et al., (Pub. No. US2004/0201627 A1), hereinafter "Maddocks", and Bonnell et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081), hereinafter "Bonnell". Of the above-rejected claims, claims 26, 28, 30, 31 and 32 have been canceled.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to include limitations related to the UNDO command of the invention. The UNDO command of the invention is described in detail from page 7, line 4 to page 9, line 6 of the application as originally filed. Maddocks and Bonnell lack an Undo command. With the Applicants' invention, in the text file that contains the commands, there are UNDO commands for at least some of the underlying commands. There is a specific option for a user to execute an UNDO command that is associated with the underlying command. For example, on a line in that text file, there can be the command "mkdir <dirname>" to create a file directory. Following that command is an UNDO command "rmdir <dirname>". If a user selects this line and presses the Step button **220**, a directory is created. Then, if the user has a change of mind, the user presses the Undo Step button **224** to execute the UNDO command to remove the directory. The invention lets the user have more control and to intervene with the commands.

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants believe that the combination of Maddocks and Foster does not teach or suggest all the steps of amended claims 1 and 17 nor all the elements of amended claim 9, and that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome.

Claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 depend upon independent amended claim 1, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed that dependent claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 also recite in allowable form. Claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 depend upon independent amended claim 9, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed that dependent claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 also recite in allowable form. Claims 19, 20, 22, 23 and 27 depend upon independent

Page 10 of 13

amended claim 17, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed that dependent claims 19, 20, 22, 23 and 27 also recite in allowable form.

Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner allow claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 15-17, 19-20, 22-23 and 27.

(10) The Examiner rejected claims 13, 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks et al., (Pub. No. US2004/0201627 A1) and Bonnell et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081) and further in view of Foster et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,260), hereinafter "Foster". Claims 13, 25 and 29, which pertain to the UNDO command of the invention, have been canceled. However, independent claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to recite the UNDO command. Amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17 should be allowed for the following reasons.

The Examiner is correct that neither Maddocks nor Bonnell teach the UNDO command of the invention. The Examiner is also correct that the word "undo" is mentioned in Foster. Except for the coincidence that Foster and the Applicants decided to use the same word for two different concepts, there is no other relationship between the "undo" of Foster and the UNDO command of the invention.

Foster describes a method of maintaining consistency of device driver settings. The device driver settings have "attributes". The attributes must follow certain "rules". Foster allows a user to change the values of the attributes, and describes a method for reviewing all device driver settings for consistency. By allowing inconsistent attributes (i.e., attributes that violate the rules) to exist and then be corrected, Foster makes user interface programming source code more manageable. Attributes values, including inconsistent attribute values, are stored in an "undo list" of Foster.

In Foster, an attribute of a device setting can be changed. Foster does not teach operating system commands; therefore, Foster does not teach changing an argument of an operating system command. Changing an attribute of a device driver is not equivalent to changing an argument of an operating system command. Even if it were equivalent,

Page 11 of 13

changing an argument of an operating system command is not the same as *undoing* the effect of the command. Changing an argument of an operating system command does create an UNDO command. An example of an argument in an operating system command is the command "COPY A to B". In this command, "A" and "B" are arguments of the command. Changing an argument of this command means, for example, changing "COPY A to B" to "COPY A to C". Changing an argument value of a command is different from undoing the effect of a command. Changing an argument value of a command does not create an UNDO command.

Conclusion

(11-13) The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed September 22, 2005, and it is suggested that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11-13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25-31 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11-12, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 27 is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR §1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicants and their attorneys.

Page 12 of 13

The present application, after entry of this amendment, comprises sixteen (16) claims, including three (3) independent claims. Applicants have previously paid for twenty-four (24) claims including five (5) independent claims. Applicants, therefore, believe that an additional fee for claims amendment is currently not due.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that in any way it would help expedite the prosecution of the patent application, a telephone call to the undersigned at (561) 989-9811 is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1556.

In view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and re-examination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/11/2005

By: Jose Gutman

Jose Gutman
Reg. No. 35,171

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN
BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
551 N.W. 77th Street, Suite 111
Boca Raton, FL 33487
Tel (561) 989-9811
Fax (561) 989-9812